

COMPLETE POSITIVITY AND NEUTRON INTERFEROMETRY

F. Benatti

Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy
and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste

R. Floreanini

Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Trieste
Dipartimento di Fisica Teorica, Università di Trieste
Strada Costiera 11, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Abstract

We analyze the dynamics of neutron beams in interferometry experiments using quantum dynamical semigroups. We show that these experiments could provide stringent limits on the non-standard, dissipative terms appearing in the extended evolution equations.

An open quantum system can be modeled in general as being a small subsystem in interaction with a suitable large environment. Although the global dynamics of the compound system is described by unitary transformations generated by the total hamiltonian, the effective time evolution of the subsystem usually manifests dissipation and irreversibility.

This reduced dynamics, obtained by eliminating (*i.e.* by tracing over) the environment degrees of freedom, turns out to be in general rather complicated. However, under some mild assumptions, that essentially ask for a weak coupling between system and environment, one obtains a subdynamics free from memory effects, that can be realized in terms of linear maps. Furthermore, this set of transformations possesses very basic and fundamental physical properties, like forward in time composition (semigroup property), probability conservation, entropy increase and complete positivity. They form a so-called quantum dynamical semigroup.[1-3]

This description is rather universal and can be applied to model a large variety of different physical situations, ranging from the study of quantum statistical systems,[1-3] to the analysis of dissipative effects in quantum optics,[4-6] to the discussion of the interaction of a microsystem with a macroscopic measuring apparatus.[7-9] It has also been proposed as an effective description for phenomena leading to loss of quantum coherence,[10-14] induced by quantum gravity effects at Planck's scale.[15] The basic idea is that space-time should be topologically nontrivial at this scale, manifesting a complicated "foamy" structure; as a consequence, transitions from pure to mixed states could be conceivable (for more recent elaborations, see [16]).

Analysis based on the study of the dynamics of strings also support, from a different point of view, the idea of loss of quantum coherence.[17,18] In this respect, one can show that, in a rather model-independent way, a non-unitary, dissipative, completely positive subdynamics is the direct result of the weak interaction with an environment constituted by a gas of D0-branes, effectively described by a heat-bath of quanta obeying infinite statistics.[18]

These results suggest that it should be possible to observe dissipative, non-standard effects in many quantum systems. However, crude dimensional estimates show that these effects are in general tiny, and therefore unobservable in practice.

Nevertheless, a detailed analysis of the dynamics and decay of the neutral kaon system based on quantum dynamical semigroups shows that the non-standard contributions in the extended time-evolution equations could lead to testable effects.[19, 20, 21-23] These non-standard terms can be parametrized by six real phenomenological constants, whose presence modify the expressions of usual $K-\bar{K}$ observables, like decay rates and asymmetries.[21, 22] Although the present experimental data are not accurate enough to detect these modifications, the next generation of kaon experiments should be able to put stringent limits on the six non-standard parameters. In this respect, particularly promising are the experiments at ϕ -factories,[23] where systems of correlated neutral kaons are copiously produced. One should note that the description of the kaon dynamics in terms of completely positive maps is in this case essential in order to obtain a consistent extension of the standard quantum mechanical time-evolution (for a complete discussion, see [24]).

Another system in which non-standard quantum evolutions based on dynamical semigroups can be studied is a neutron interferometer.[25-28] The capability of producing very slow neutron beams at reactors, together with the technological ability of producing and cutting with high precision macroscopic silicon crystals have made possible direct, very accurate tests of various physical phenomena.[25-30]

In a typical experimental setup, a neutron beam is split into two components which travel along different paths and are subsequently brought together to interfere. The two components pass through a tiny slab of material before interfering; this produces a relative “phase shift” between the two splitted beams. By varying the relative orientation of the slab across the two beams, one obtains an interference figure. This figure changes under the action of various external phenomena, produced *e.g.* by earth gravity and rotation, or by an external magnetic field (earth magnetic field is usually properly screened); the corresponding theoretically calculated phase shifts induced by these phenomena have all been experimentally checked with high precision by analyzing the modified interference patterns.[28-30]

In the following, we shall analyze in detail the dynamics of the neutron beams in such interferometric devices under the hypothesis that the corresponding time-evolution be described by a quantum dynamical semigroup. We shall see that, at least in principle, neutron interferometry experiments could provide very accurate estimates of the non-standard, dissipative terms appearing in the corresponding evolution equations. A preliminary analysis based on recent published data from one of those experiments will also be presented.

States of a quantum system evolving in time can be suitably described by a density matrix ρ ; this is a positive, hermitian operator, *i.e.* with positive eigenvalues, and constant trace. We shall analyze the evolution of neutrons in an abstract interferometer, where the original monoenergetic beam is splitted in two components that then interfere at the end, giving rise to intensity fringe patterns in two possible exit beams. We can model this generic physical setup by means of a two-dimensional Hilbert space, taking as basis states those corresponding to the two components of the split beam inside the interferometer.

With respect to this basis, the density matrix ρ describing the state of our physical system can be written as:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & \rho_3 \\ \rho_4 & \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_4 \equiv \rho_3^*$, and $*$ signifies complex conjugation.

As explained in the introductory remarks, our analysis is based on the assumption that the evolution in time of the neutrons inside the interferometer is given by a quantum dynamical semigroup, *i.e.* by a completely positive, one parameter (=time) family of linear maps: $\rho(0) \mapsto \rho(t)$. These maps are generated by equations of the following form:

$$\frac{\partial \rho(t)}{\partial t} = -iH\rho(t) + i\rho(t)H + L[\rho(t)]. \quad (2)$$

The first two terms in the r.h.s. of this equation are the standard quantum mechanical ones. They contain the effective (time-independent) hamiltonian H , that can be taken to be

hermitian, since the fact that the neutrons are unstable can be neglected in interferometry experiments.

The third piece $L[\rho]$ is a linear map, whose form is fully determined by the requirement of complete positivity and trace conservation:[1-3]

$$L[\rho] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_j \left(A_j^\dagger A_j \rho + \rho A_j^\dagger A_j \right) + \sum_j A_j \rho A_j^\dagger. \quad (3)$$

The operators A_j must be such that $\sum_j A_j^\dagger A_j$ is a well-defined 2×2 matrix; further, to assure entropy increase, the A_j can be taken to be hermitian. In absence of $L[\rho]$, pure states (*i.e.* states of the form $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$) would be transformed into pure states. Instead, the additional piece in (3) produces dissipation and possible transitions from pure to mixed states.

As already mentioned, equations of the form (2), (3) have been used to describe various phenomena connected with open quantum systems; in particular, they have been applied to analyze the propagation and decay of the neutral kaon system.[21-24] Although the basic general idea behind these treatments is that quantum phenomena at Planck's length produce loss of phase-coherence, it should be stressed that the form (2), (3) of the evolution equation is independent from the microscopic mechanism responsible for the dissipative effects. Indeed, equations (2) and (3) are the result of very basic physical assumptions, like probability conservation, entropy increase, complete positivity, and therefore should be regarded as phenomenological in nature.

Among the just mentioned physical requirements, complete positivity is perhaps the less intuitive. Indeed, it has not been enforced in previous analysis, in favor of the more obvious simple positivity.[10, 19, 20] Simple positivity is in fact enough to guarantee that the eigenvalues of the density matrix $\rho(t)$ describing our system remain positive at any time; this is an unavoidable requirement in view of the probabilistic interpretation of ρ .

Complete positivity is a stronger property, in the sense that it assures the positivity of the density matrix describing the states of a larger system, obtained by coupling in a trivial way the system under study with another arbitrary finite-dimensional one. At first, the requirement of complete positivity of (2) seems a mere technical complication. Nevertheless, it turns out to be essential in properly treating correlated systems, like the two neutral kaons coming from the decay of a ϕ -meson; it assures the absence of unphysical effects, like the appearance of negative probabilities, that could occur for just simply positive dynamics.[23, 24] One should also add that standard unitary quantum mechanical time evolutions satisfies this property in a rather trivial way. For these reasons, in analyzing possible non-standard, dissipative effects even in simpler, non correlated systems, the phenomenological equations (2) and (3) should be used.

In the particular case of neutron interferometers, as for the $K-\bar{K}$ system, a more explicit description of (2) and (3) can be given. In the chosen basis, the effective hamiltonian can be written as:

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} E + \omega & 0 \\ 0 & E - \omega \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Indeed, the neutron beams inside the interferometer can be assimilated to a two-level system, with E the incident (kinetic) neutron energy. The splitting in energy 2ω among

the two internal beams can be induced by various physical effects. In the following, we shall consider the case of a thin slab of material (*e.g.* aluminium) inserted transversally to the two split beams. A slight rotation of this slab produces different effective interactions of the neutrons with the slab material in the two internal paths, yielding a non-vanishing ω . Using an eikonal approximation, perfectly suitable for describing slow neutrons, one can theoretically compute this energy splitting in terms of the neutron-nuclear scattering parameters for the slab material.[25-27] Typically, one finds that ω is of the order of 10^{-7} eV.

The explicit form of the term $L[\rho]$ in (3) can be most simply given by expanding the 2×2 matrix ρ in terms of Pauli matrices σ_i and the identity σ_0 : $\rho = \rho_\mu \sigma_\mu$, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$. In this way, the map $L[\rho]$ can be represented by a symmetric 4×4 matrix $[L_{\mu\nu}]$, acting on the column vector with components $(\rho_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3)$. It can be parametrized by the six real constants a, b, c, α, β , and γ :[21]

$$[L_{\mu\nu}] = -2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & b & c \\ 0 & b & \alpha & \beta \\ 0 & c & \beta & \gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

with a, α and γ non-negative. These parameters are not all independent; the condition of complete positivity of the time-evolution $\rho \rightarrow \rho(t)$ imposes the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned} 2R \equiv \alpha + \gamma - a &\geq 0, & RS &\geq b^2, \\ 2S \equiv a + \gamma - \alpha &\geq 0, & RT &\geq c^2, \\ 2T \equiv a + \alpha - \gamma &\geq 0, & ST &\geq \beta^2, \\ RST &\geq 2bc\beta + R\beta^2 + Sc^2 + Tb^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

As already observed, the dissipative correction (5) to the evolution equation (2) should be regarded as phenomenological; it is therefore difficult to give an apriori estimate of the magnitude of the non-standard parameters in (5). However, following the idea that the term $L[\rho]$ originates from quantum effects at Planck's scale, one expects the values of a, b, c, α, β and γ to be very small, at most of the order $m_n^2/m_P \simeq 10^{-19}$ GeV, where m_n is the neutron mass, while m_P is the Planck scale. The dissipative contribution $L[\rho]$ in (2) is therefore at least three order of magnitude smaller than the one given by the standard hamiltonian terms: this allows an approximate analysis of the evolution equation (2), in which the term (5) can be treated as a small perturbation.

For the considerations that follows, it will be sufficient to stop at the first order in the perturbative expansion. For generic initial conditions, the time dependence of the four components of the corresponding solution $\rho(t)$ of (2) is explicitly given by:

$$\rho_1(t) = (1 - \gamma t) \rho_1 + \gamma t \rho_2 - \frac{C}{\omega} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) \rho_3 - \frac{C^*}{\omega} e^{i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) \rho_4, \quad (7a)$$

$$\rho_2(t) = \gamma t \rho_1 + (1 - \gamma t) \rho_2 + \frac{C}{\omega} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) \rho_3 + \frac{C^*}{\omega} e^{i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) \rho_4, \quad (7b)$$

$$\rho_3(t) = -\frac{C^*}{\omega} e^{-i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) (\rho_1 - \rho_2) + (1 - At) e^{-2i\omega t} \rho_3 + \frac{B}{2\omega} \sin(2\omega t) \rho_4 , \quad (7c)$$

$$\rho_4(t) = -\frac{C}{\omega} e^{i\omega t} \sin(\omega t) (\rho_1 - \rho_2) + \frac{B^*}{2\omega} \sin(2\omega t) \rho_3 + (1 - At) e^{2i\omega t} \rho_4 , \quad (7d)$$

where the following convenient combinations of the non-standard parameters have been introduced:

$$A = \alpha + a , \quad B = \alpha - a + 2ib , \quad C = c + i\beta . \quad (8)$$

Any physical property of the diffracted neutron beams exiting the interferometer can be extracted from the solution (7) for the density matrix $\rho(t)$ by computing its trace with suitable hermitian operators. In particular, the observation of the neutron intensity pattern just outside the interferometer corresponds to the computation of the mean value of the following projector operators:[10]

$$\mathcal{O}_+ = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{i\theta} \\ e^{-i\theta} & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \mathcal{O}_- = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{i(\theta+\pi)} \\ e^{-i(\theta+\pi)} & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \quad (9)$$

that refer to the two possible exit beams in which a neutron can be found, having traveled the whole interferometer;[27] the parameter θ is a phase which depends on the specific experimental setup. Then, the intensity $I_{\pm}$ of the interference figure in the two exit beams is given by:

$$I_{\pm}(t) = \langle \mathcal{O}_{\pm} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{O}_{\pm} \rho(t)] . \quad (10)$$

In the basis we are using, the initial conditions for a neutron entering the interferometer is given by one of the following two density matrices:

$$\rho^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} , \quad \rho^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (11)$$

They correspond to the two possible choices of orientation of the incident neutron beam with respect to the interferometer, and give rise to the same final results; in the following, we shall work with $\rho^{(1)}$. Inserting this initial condition in the time evolution given by (7), from (10) one obtains the following two interference patterns:

$$I_{\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 \pm \left[e^{-At} \cos(\theta + 2\omega t) + \frac{|B|}{2\omega} \sin(2\omega t) \cos(\theta - \theta_B) \right] \right\} , \quad (12)$$

where $|B|$ and θ_B are modulus and phase of B in (8); this formula holds for times such that $At \ll 1$. Since a neutron having traveled fully inside the interferometer can only be detected in one of the two exit beams, particle conservation requires: $I_+(t) + I_-(t) = 1$, as it is evident from (12).

The interference figures described by (12) are those produced by a perfectly monoenergetic neutron incident beam and an ideal interferometer. In practice, the neutron momenta in the incident beam have a finite distribution of magnitude and directions; furthermore, there are always slight imperfections in the construction of the interferometer, not to mention residual strains in the crystal itself. These effects can only partially be controlled,

and produce significant attenuation in the intensity of the interference figures. Detailed calculations based on neutron optics allow precise estimates of the modifications that are needed in the spectra (12) in order to take into account those effects.[25-27] In keeping with our phenomenological point of view, we will not use directly those estimates, but rather modify the expressions (12) by introducing suitable unknown parameters. By denoting with $N_{\pm}$ the actual neutron countings at the two exit beams, one generalizes the spectra in (12) as:

$$N_{\pm}(t) = N_{\pm}^{(0)} \left\{ 1 \pm \mathcal{C}_{\pm} \left[e^{-At} \cos(\theta + 2\omega t) + \frac{|B|}{2\omega} \sin(2\omega t) \cos(\theta - \theta_B) \right] \right\}. \quad (13)$$

The parameters $\mathcal{C}_{\pm}$, the so-called fringe contrast, take into account the previously mentioned intensity attenuation, while $N_{\pm}^{(0)}$ are just normalization constants. Clearly, the accuracy of the determination of the parameters A and B from the measured data will increase as the fringe contrast gets closer to one. In actual experiments, one finds that the best values for $\mathcal{C}_{\pm}$ are usually around 0.6. Further, note that now particle conservation requires:

$$N_+^{(0)} \mathcal{C}_+ = N_-^{(0)} \mathcal{C}_-. \quad (14)$$

In order to be able to compare the phenomenological predictions (13) with actual experimental data, further elaborations are required. Although the intensity spectra in (13) are time-dependent, in an interference experiment, being the paths followed by the neutrons fixed, the evolution time t is also fixed; it can only be modified by changing the wavelength (*i.e.* the energy) of the primary neutron beam. It follows that the phase $\varphi \equiv 2\omega t$ that gives the interference figure can be varied only by changing the energy split ω between the two paths inside the interferometer, *i.e.* by changing the orientation of the material slab with respect to the neutron beams.

Also, since t is fixed, it is not possible a priori to extract the fringe contrast parameters $\mathcal{C}_{\pm}$ from the φ -dependence of the intensities $N_{\pm}$. In other words, in comparing the behaviour in (13) with that given by the experiment, one needs to use the following form for the two intensity patterns:

$$N_{\pm}(\varphi) = N_{\pm}^{(0)} \left\{ 1 \pm \left[P_{\pm} \cos(\theta + \varphi) + Q_{\pm} \frac{\sin \varphi}{\varphi} \right] \right\}, \quad (15)$$

where

$$P_{\pm} = \mathcal{C}_{\pm} e^{-At}, \quad Q_{\pm} = \mathcal{C}_{\pm} |B| t \cos(\theta - \theta_B). \quad (16)$$

A fit with the experimental data will give estimates for the parameters $N_{\pm}^{(0)}$, $P_{\pm}$, $Q_{\pm}$ and θ ; at least in principle, this is sufficient to determine the non-standard constants A and B .

We have performed a preliminary χ^2 fit of the formulas in (15) with recent experimental data, published in [30]. In that experiment, a so-called skew-symmetric silicon interferometer and polarized neutrons were used to study the “geometrical phase” of the neutron wavefunction; however, in order to check the apparatus, also standard interferometric spectra had been taken. In this way, the experimental setup described in [30] is an

actual realization of the abstract interferometer so far discussed in deriving (15). Although the results of other recent interferometry experiments are also available,[28] in lacking for an ad-hoc experiment, we find the presentation of the data in [30] the more suitable for the analysis of the consequences of the evolution equation (2) and (5). The results of our fit can be summarized as follows:

$$N_+^{(0)} = 942 \pm 6 \quad P_+ = 0.17 \pm 0.01 \quad Q_+ = 0.02 \pm 0.02 \quad \theta = 0.09 \pm 0.05 \quad (17a)$$

$$N_-^{(0)} = 366 \pm 4 \quad P_- = 0.46 \pm 0.02 \quad Q_- = 0.06 \pm 0.02 \quad \theta = 0.03 \pm 0.03 . \quad (17b)$$

Extracting estimates for the parameters A and B from these results requires the determination of the fringe contrast $\mathcal{C}_\pm$, characterizing the “optical” properties of the neutron interferometer. These constants are in fact function of the imaginary part of the refraction index of the material from which the interferometer is built.[27] Therefore, the best way to obtain estimates for $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ is to measure the interference spectra with two neutron beams of wavelength λ and $\lambda/2$, [29] keeping unchanged the rest of the experimental setup. By comparing the corresponding fit estimates for the coefficients $P_\pm$ and $Q_\pm$, with the help of neutron optics theory, one is then able to extract the values of $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ at wavelength λ .

In lacking of a two-wavelength experiment, in the following we shall estimate $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ using directly the data. In the standard quantum mechanical case, *i.e.* for $A = B = 0$, one can easily obtain the coefficients $\mathcal{C}_\pm$ from the maximum $N^{(\max)}$ and the minimum $N^{(\min)}$ neutron counts of the experimental interference figures. Indeed, from (15) with $A = B = 0$, one obtains:

$$\mathcal{C}_\pm = \frac{N_\pm^{(\max)} - N_\pm^{(\min)}}{N_\pm^{(\max)} + N_\pm^{(\min)}} . \quad (18)$$

Although this relation is only approximately valid for nonvanishing A and B , in practice one can still use (18) with confidence, since the systematic error that one thus makes in the evaluation of the parameters A and B can be estimated at the end to be much smaller than the pure experimental uncertainty.

Using the experimental data and (18), one obtains: $\mathcal{C}_+ = 0.19 \pm 0.02$ and $\mathcal{C}_- = 0.54 \pm 0.03$. As an independent test of the correctness of this evaluation, one can check that, within the errors, the relation (14) is perfectly satisfied. Note that the value of $\mathcal{C}_+$ is significantly smaller than one, while that of $\mathcal{C}_-$ is close to the best figures that can be attained in practice.[26-28] This difference in the fringe contrast of the two data samples will result in a significantly less accurate determination of the non-standard parameters A and B from the the results in (17a) with respects to those in (17b).

The flight time t of the neutrons inside the interferometer can be very accurately determined by using the geometric specifications of the silicon interferometer used in [30], so that $1/t = 5.83 \times 10^{-21}$ GeV. Further, on general grounds one expects $\mathcal{R}e(B)$ and $\mathcal{I}m(B)$ to be of the same order of magnitude (for the case of the neutral kaon system, see [22]); then, as a working assumption, we shall neglect the small phase θ with respect to θ_B in (16), so that only the real part of B can be extracted from the estimates of $Q_\pm$. Putting everything together, one finally obtains from (17a): $A = (0.71 \pm 0.73) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV and $\mathcal{R}e(B) = (0.76 \pm 0.49) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV, while from (17b): $A = (0.84 \pm 0.41) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV

and $\mathcal{R}e(B) = (0.65 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV. These two estimates are compatible, but, as expected, the second one is much more accurate.

Alternatively, recalling the definitions (8), one can express the previous results as an estimate for the parameters a and α of (5); using the best values for A and $\mathcal{R}e(B)$, one finds: $a = (0.10 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV, $\alpha = (0.74 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-21}$ GeV. Although these values should be taken as indicative, they seem to suggest a possible nonvanishing value for α , while a is compatible with zero at the present level of accuracy.

If the non-standard parameter a actually vanishes, the expression (5) of the extra term $L[\rho]$ in the evolution equation (2) greatly simplifies. Indeed, for $a = 0$, the inequalities (6) readily imply: $\gamma = \alpha$, $b = c = \beta = 0$. In this case, the evolution equation (2) gives the most simple extension of ordinary quantum mechanics, compatible with the condition of complete positivity.

In this simplified situation, the combinations A and B in (8) become both equal to α , so that the relations (16) are modified as:

$$P_{\pm} = \mathcal{C}_{\pm} e^{-\alpha t} \simeq \mathcal{C}_{\pm} (1 - \alpha t) , \quad Q_{\pm} = \mathcal{C}_{\pm} \alpha t \cos \theta . \quad (19)$$

By eliminating αt from these two formulas, one is now able to determine the fringe contrast factors $\mathcal{C}_{\pm}$ from the fitted parameters $P_{\pm}$ and $Q_{\pm}$ without further assumptions: $\mathcal{C}_{+} = 0.20 \pm 0.02$, $\mathcal{C}_{-} = 0.52 \pm 0.03$. Note that these values are equal within errors to those determined before. Then, from either of the relations in (19), one obtains two determinations of the parameter α , which combined finally give:

$$\alpha = (0.71 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-21} \text{ GeV} . \quad (20)$$

Although this estimate for α points toward a nonvanishing value, roughly of the right order of magnitude for a quantum gravity or “stringy” origin, it should not be regarded as an evidence for non-standard, dissipative effects in the dynamics describing neutron interferometry. Rather, it should be considered as a rough evaluation of the sensitivity that present neutron interferometry experiments can reach in testing quantum dynamical time evolutions of the form given in (2) and (5).

In closing, we would like to make a few comments on the existing literature on the subject. In our study of the effects of the environment on the propagation of the neutrons inside the interferometer, we have assumed that the refractive phenomena on the various silicon blades of the device be described by standard neutron optics. This theory is the result of a quantum mechanical analysis of the scattering of the neutron beams by the nuclei in the silicon crystal. For slow neutrons, the effects of these scattering phenomena can be effectively described by a model that resemble very closely “geometric optics” of light propagation theory.[25-27]

In principle, non-standard dissipative effects can also be present in the scattering neutron-nucleus;[31-33] these phenomena can be described again by phenomenological equations of the form (2), (3), and could modify the predictions of standard neutron optics. A precise estimate of these changements requires detailed computations that certainly go beyond the scope of the present investigation. In any case, it should be stressed that these possible dissipative effects in the interaction neutron-nucleus would mostly affect the estimate of the intrinsic interferometer parameters, like the fringe contrast or the phase θ ,

as functions of the wavelength of the incident neutrons and the nuclear properties of the refractive material. In our study, these parameters have been obtained directly from the experimental data, so that we expect little changes in our analysis from these extra effects. Nevertheless, the entire topic certainly deserves further attention and we hope to come back to these problems in the future.

A study of possible phenomena violating quantum mechanics in neutron interferometry has been originally presented in [10]. There, an equation of the form (2) has also been used to describe these effects, but without imposing the condition of complete positivity. Fitting an approximated formula for the exit beams interference figures with the experimental data available at that time, limits on some of the parameters violating quantum mechanics were given. These limits have been further strengthened by later analysis,[34] exploiting wavefront splitting interference experiments (the analogs of Young's two slit experiment).

These estimates turn out to be rather crude: they are based on a rough evaluation of the flight-time of the neutrons inside the interferometer, rather than a detailed analysis of the interference patterns. Furthermore, as already mentioned, lacking of imposing the condition of complete positivity on the evolution equation could lead to serious inconsistencies.[24] We stress that to avoid these problems, one needs to adopt phenomenological descriptions based on equations (2) and (3).

Finally, the neutron interference experiments realized so far allows determining at best the values of only two of the six non-standard parameters in (5). The remaining ones could be estimated, at least in principle, by studying the behaviour of other observables $\mathcal{O}$, different from those appearing in (9). This would allow a direct test of the inequalities (6) and therefore of the hypothesis of complete positivity.

In practice, however, the analysis of these new observables would correspond to the realization of completely different experimental setups. In this respect, a detailed study of possible non-standard, dissipative effects in neutron interferometry appears to be an exiting challenge not only theoretically, but experimentally as well.

REFERENCES

1. R. Alicki and K. Lendi, *Quantum Dynamical Semigroups and Applications*, Lect. Notes Phys. **286**, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987)
2. V. Gorini, A. Frigerio, M. Verri, A. Kossakowski and E.C.G. Surdarshan, Rep. Math. Phys. **13** (1978) 149
3. H. Spohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **53** (1980) 569
4. W.H. Louisell, *Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation*, (Wiley, New York, 1973)
5. C.W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, Berlin, 1992)
6. M.O. Scully and M.S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997)
7. L. Fonda, G.C. Ghirardi and A. Rimini, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41** (1978) 587
8. H. Nakazato, M. Namiki and S. Pascazio, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **B10** (1996) 247
9. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B428** (1998) 149
10. J. Ellis, J.S. Hagelin, D.V. Nanopoulos and M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B241** (1984) 381;
11. S. Coleman, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 867
12. S.B. Giddings and A. Strominger, Nucl. Phys. **B307** (1988) 854
13. M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B410** (1993) 143
14. L.J. Garay, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80** (1998) 2508; Thermal properties of spacetime foam, [gr-qc/9806047](#)
15. S. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1983) 395; Phys. Rev. D **37** (1988) 904; Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3099
16. S. Hawking and C. Hunter, Gravitational entropy and global structure, [hep-th/9808085](#)
17. J. Ellis, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B293** (1992) 37; Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11** (1996) 1489
18. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Non-standard neutral kaons dynamics from D-branes statistics, [hep-th/9811196](#)
19. J. Ellis, J.L. Lopez, N.E. Mavromatos and D.V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 3846
20. P. Huet and M.E. Peskin, Nucl. Phys. **B434** (1995) 3
21. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Nucl. Phys. **B488** (1997) 335
22. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Phys. Lett. **B401** (1997) 337
23. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Nucl. Phys. **B511** (1998) 550
24. F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A12** (1997) 1465; Banach Center Publications, **43** (1998) 71; Comment on “Searching for evolutions of pure states into mixed states in the two-state system $K-\bar{K}$ ”, [hep-ph/9806450](#)

25. J.L. Staudenmann, S.A. Werner, R. Colella and A.W. Overhauser, Phys. Rev. A **21** (1980) 1419
26. S.A. Werner and A.G. Klein, Meth. Exp. Phys. **A23** (1986) 259
27. V.F. Sears, *Neutron Optics*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989)
28. *Advance in Neutron Optics and Related Research Facilities*, M. Utsuro, S. Kawano, T. Kawai and A. Kawaguchi, eds., J. Phys. Soc. Jap. **65**, Suppl.A, 1996
29. K.C. Littrell, B.E. Allman and S.A. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **56** (1997) 1767
30. B.E. Allman, H. Kaiser, S.A. Werner, A.G. Wagh, V.C. Rakhecha and J. Summhammer, Phys. Rev A **56** (1997) 4420
31. E.B. Davies, Ann. Inst. H. Poncaré, **A 29** (1978) 395; . *ibid.* **A 32** (1980) 361
32. R. Alicki, Ann. Inst. H. Poncaré, **A 35** (1981) 97; Z. Phys. A **307** (1982) 279
33. L. Lanz and B. Vacchini, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **36** (1997) 67; Phys. Rev. A **56** (1997) 4826
34. A.G. Klein, Phys. Lett. **B151** (1985) 275; Physica B **151** (1988) 44